Dealing with Fast and Confusing Positions

Knowing how to respond to complex philosophical positions won’t necessarily help because opponents often misuse them. Thus, you need to learn general tactics. There are three tools when you can’t flow the case.

In cross examination, ask to see the case and make them explain it. This stops them from rereading complicated cards. Also, figure out how they plan to extend it. Further, taking the case allows you to read along with the arguments as they explain. Don’t freak out.

Read the judge’s body language. See whether they understand the position. Don’t assume that even if a judge is annoyed they’ll vote for you automatically. The dilemma with judges is sometimes they want to sound cool and vote for the intellectual argument, even if they didn’t understand it.

Use your flow. Try to get down as much rhetoric as you can, so you can clarify later.

In rebuttals, remember that the argument is still a claim, warrant, and impact. Engage arguments and how they function. Identify interactions between arguments. Answer the lynchpin. Point out contradictions. Don’t over-focus or under-focus. Be likable.

Different types of confusing positions:

1. Answering a Kritik. You don’t have to run them to answer them. The structure is framework, link, impact, and alternative. Try to delink the links. Second, turn the impact. Third, answer the alternative. Fourth, show a contradiction how they link into the kritik more than you.
2. Answering a Counterplan. Against opportunity cost competition, claim that we aren’t limited to only one action. Say that the counterplan is actually Affirmative ground. Further, you can perm the counterplan. Against net benefits, either take out the benefit or outweigh the benefit.